

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending. Claims 7 and 9 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner for being drawn to a non-elected species. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is presented herein.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,934,397 to Schaper in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,085,071 to Mizushina et al. (Mizushina). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaper in view of Mizushina as applied to Claim 11, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,289,890 to Toyota et al (Toyota). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As noted in the Response dated August 30, 2005, Claim 1 recites a hybrid vehicle including an engine for driving main driving wheels; and a plurality of motors for driving sub driving wheels, wherein a speed reduction member is disposed between the sub motor and the main motor, and wherein at least one motor is selected from the plurality of motors to drive the sub driving wheels according to a driving force required by the vehicle.

Contrary to the position taken in the previous Office Action (dated May 31, 2005), the outstanding Office Action now admits Schaper fails to disclose a speed reduction member. See that last paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action.

The Office Action now cites Mizushina and alleges Mizushina teaches a driving power source unit having motors (101, 102) with a speed reduction gear (2) disposed directly between the motors (101, 102). As such, the Office Action asserts it would have

been obvious to modify the Schaper hybrid vehicle to include a speed reduction member between the motors as taught by Mizushina in order to selectively output driving torque of a sole motor and the combined torque of both motors.

Applicants have reviewed Mizushina and respectfully submit the assertion made by the Office Action is factually incorrect.

As noted by the Office Action, Figures 2-3 of Mizushina illustrate a driving power source having two motors, i.e., motors 101, 102. However, contrary to the assertion made by the Office Action, a step-up gear (2) is directly disposed between the motors 101, 102 and not a speed reduction member. Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would never confuse a speed reduction member with a step-up gear. In fact, while the speed reduction member does just that, i.e., reduces the speed of something, the step-up gear (2) disclosed by Mizushina does the complete opposite, i.e., increases the speed of something.

Applicants note Column 6, lines 40-51 of Mizushina states “[t]he step-up gear unit 2 employs a helical gear arrangement for forming **a speed increasing mechanism for increasing the revolution speed of the electric motor 1.**” Moreover, Column 10, lines 35-38 of Mizushina further states “[I]t should be noted that the step-up gear unit **increases the motor speed for about six to ten times** in order to obtain substantially equivalent inertia characteristics to that of the automotive engine.”

Put simply, Mizushina fails to teach or suggest a speed reduction member and, as clearly pointed out above, actually teaches away from such a feature as the step-up gear (2) taught by Mizushina increases the speed of the motors 101, 102 rather than decrease or reduce the speeds thereof.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Mizushina, like Schaper, fails to teach or suggest a speed reduction member being disposed between two motors as Mizushina actually teaches a speed increasing member disposed between two motors.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, each and every feature recited by a rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the applied art of record. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. As explained above, Schaper and Mizushina, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 1 since neither reference teaches a speed reduction member disposed between two motors.

Furthermore, Applicants note Mizushina teaches an automotive internal combustion engine ***simulated*** driving power source, i.e., the driving power source taught by Mizushina is a ***simulated*** driving power source not an actual driving power source that is physically placed in a motor vehicle. In fact, Applicants note the simulated driving power source taught by Mizushina is disposed on a flat surface, e.g., a floor or other solid surface, and not incorporated into or on a motor vehicle. Applicants respectfully submit there is no teaching whatsoever that the simulated driving power source taught by Mizushina can even be mounted on or incorporated into a motor vehicle let alone the vehicle taught by Schaper. Because the driving power source taught by Mizushina is a simulated system, Applicants respectfully submit one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider it obvious to modify the Schaper vehicle based on the teachings of the Mizushina since there is no way such a person of ordinary skill would be able to reasonably predict the likelihood of success of such a modification at the time the present invention was made as required under M.P.E.P. § 2143.02.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 is not rendered obvious in view of the teachings of Schaper and Mizushina and should be deemed allowable.

Toyoda is cited for teaching a drive unit having an electromagnetic clutch. Applicants respectfully submit Toyoda fails to overcome or otherwise address the deficiencies in Schaper and Mizushina.

Claims 2-6, 8 and 10-13 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

As noted in the Response to Restriction Requirement filed on April 22, 2005, Applicants submit Claim 1 is a generic claim. Upon the allowance of generic Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and rejoinder of non-elected Claim 7 and 9 as provided by 37 C.F.R. §1.141.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, rejoinder of Claims 7 and 9, allowance of Claims 1-13, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107355-00087.**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Murat Ozgu', is written over the printed name.

Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 857-6385

CMM:MO:elp